A U M

Let there be ten, a hundred, a thousand transformations of nature; what are these changes to me? The sky is not stained by the lowering cloud.
—CREST JEWEL OF WISDOM.

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXVII June, 1939 No. 8

OF TEACHERS THERE ARE MANY —

EVERY age has its Teacher. At one time he walks among men, becomes like unto them in all things, so they may see that in themselves which is the same, and that which is different. In another time he may work in secret, when a single true disciple is his greatest hope. Sometimes the most that men can learn is that the Teacher came among them, is gone, and they knew Him not.

There are cycles when the learning comes not from an embodied teacher, but as an avenging terror of the outraged Law. May be a mighty shudder in the suffering frame of Mother Earth; may be a black pestilence that sweeps across her surface, destroying that which men had thought they were—their bodies. And while the air is yet full of Souls, a wise one who is himself but another kind of embodiment of the Law, speaks for its justice. Sometimes, because men learn from suffering, they think that Truth is but one long, expiring agony. Then Truth can only turn away in helpless pity, leaving exposed her other face of joy. Men can see only what they will see; the Omnipresent Spirit, born in a world of selfishness, must be as helpless as the littlest babe.

Because some truths are written down in books, men say, Let us read and become wise. They raise great libraries to house the nonsense of the ages; yet Truth is there, too, unperceived. Men list their books and count their words, and build and unbuild structures of ideas, until so thin and weak is their reality that a gust of wind blows them all away. And while the scholars sigh new spirits come to read the Book of Nature, as though this were some new discovery. Soon those who used to list the parts of speech because the Logos has its form of Sound, now catalogue the planets and the

stars. All nature must be fitted in the code: the birds, the creeping and the swimming things; the grasses, trees and flowers; the animals and man—nothing can be left out of this new book of nature. Men cry, Don't you see? We are writing the Book over again, and when we are finished everyone will have the Truth! And, some of them add, if you don't see, why, then we'll *make* you.

Once in a long time a Teacher comes who tells all these things in full, Whose voice rings through the corridors of time, back to the temples of antiquity, until the knowledge of the past resounds once more in unison, the truth in dusty volumes quickens with the new vibration. For a while men listen, wonder why their hearts, so ground down with the sufferings of time, can feel in words and thought the living presence of eternity. Years pass, the age changes, and the vision dims. Because another battle rages on the plain they think the struggle that the Teacher made is won or lost; at least, it is no more.

But not all wars are fought on open plains; there are citadels on mountain crags, strongholds in the earth; there are hidden valleys where comes the planting time and after it the harvest, for armies must be fed. Men learn these lessons well when outward wars prevail, where blood is blood, and fire is fire, and brother murders brother. There's time, they say, to fight for truth, when all these things are done, forgetting that every victory for only part of humanity must cut another artery in the great body of the whole.

Men pay high honor to the great academies where boys are trained for war on land and sea, and now, in the air above. Doubtless there is a kind of merit in these things done well, as merit is in everything done well. But there is another kind of training for another kind of war; not since the days of Buddha have many men known its merit. Yet this schooling never brought suffering to a single soul, only love and hope, and strength to stand alone; to fight the fight until the endless end. Those in this school have undertaken a high mission and a heavy task—not because they think themselves so eminently fit, but because they see the need and there is no one else to do it; and because they also know that they will not be left alone in the doing.

"WHAT IS TRUTH?"

"*Truth* is the Voice of Nature and of Time —
Truth is the startling monitor *within us* —
Nought is without it, it comes from the stars,
The golden sun, and every breeze that blows. . . ."
—W. THOMPSON BACON.

". . . Fair Truth's immortal sun
Is sometimes hid in clouds; not that her light
Is in itself defective, but obscured
By my weak prejudice, imperfect faith
And all the thousand causes which obstruct
The growth of goodness. . . ."
—HANNAH MORE.

WHAT is Truth?" asked Pilate of one who, if the claims of the Christian Church are even approximately correct, must have known it. But He kept silent. And the truth which He did not divulge, remained unrevealed, for his later followers as much as for the Roman Governor. The silence of Jesus, however, on this and other occasions, does not prevent his present followers from acting as though they had received the ultimate and absolute Truth itself; and from ignoring the fact that only such Words of Wisdom had been given to them as contained a share of the truth, itself concealed in parables and dark, though beautiful, sayings.*

This policy led gradually to dogmatism and assertion. Dogmatism in churches, dogmatism in science, dogmatism everywhere. The possible truths, hazily perceived in the world of abstraction, like those inferred from observation and experiment in the world of matter, are forced upon the profane multitudes, too busy to think for themselves, under the form of *Divine revelation* and *Scientific authority*. But the same question stands open from the days of Socrates and Pilate down to our own age of wholesale negation: is there such a thing as *absolute truth* in the hands of any one party or man? Reason answers, "there cannot be." There is no room for absolute truth upon any subject whatsoever, in a world as finite and conditioned as man is himself. But there are relative truths, and we have to make the best we can of them.

NOTE—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky as the leading editorial in *Lucifer* for February, 1888. It has once before appeared in THEOSOPHY, in the August, 1915 issue, Vol. III, p. 477.—Editors.

*Jesus says to the "Twelve"—"Unto you is given the mystery of the Kingdom of God; but *unto them that are without, all things are done in parables,*" etc. (Mark iv, 11.)

In every age there have been Sages who had mastered the absolute and yet could teach but relative truths. For none yet, born of mortal woman in *our* race, has, or could have given out, the whole and the final truth to another man, for every one of us has to find that (to him) final knowledge *in* himself. As no two minds can be absolutely alike, each has to receive the supreme illumination *through* itself, according to its capacity, and from no *human* light. The greatest adept living can reveal of the Universal Truth only so much as the mind he is impressing it upon can assimilate, and no more. *Tot homines, quot sententiae*—is an immortal truism. The sun is one, but its beams are numberless; and the effects produced are beneficent or maleficent, according to the nature and constitution of the objects they shine upon. Polarity is universal, but the polariser lies in our own consciousness. In proportion as our consciousness is elevated towards absolute truth, so do we men assimilate it more or less absolutely. But man's consciousness again, is only the sunflower of the earth. Longing for the warm ray, the plant can only turn to the sun, and move round and round in following the course of the unreachable luminary: its roots keep it fast to the soil, and half its life is passed in the shadow. . . .

Still each of us can relatively reach the Sun of Truth even on this earth, and assimilate its warmest and most direct rays, however differentiated they may become after their long journey through the physical particles in space. To achieve this, there are two methods. On the physical plane we may use our mental polariscope; and, analyzing the properties of each ray, choose the purest. On the plane of spirituality, to reach the Sun of Truth we must work in dead earnest for the development of our higher nature. We know that by paralyzing gradually within ourselves the appetites of the lower personality, and thereby deadening the voice of the purely physiological mind—that mind which depends upon, and is inseparable from, its medium or *vehicle,* the organic brain—the animal man in us may make room for the spiritual; and once aroused from its latent state, the highest spiritual senses and perceptions grow in us in proportion, and develop *pari passu* with the "divine man." This is what the great adepts, the Yogis in the East and the Mystics in the West, have always done and are still doing.

But we also know, that with a few exceptions, no man of the world, no materialist, will ever believe in the existence of such adepts, or even in the possibility of such a spiritual or psychic development. "The (ancient) fool hath said in his heart, There is no God"; the modern says, "There are no adepts on earth, they

are figments of your diseased fancy." Knowing this we hasten to reassure our readers of the Thomas Didymus type. We beg them to turn in this magazine to reading more congenial to them; say to the miscellaneous papers on Hylo-Idealism, by various writers.*

For LUCIFER tries to satisfy its readers of whatever "school of thought," and shows itself equally impartial to Theist and Atheist, Mystic and Agnostic, Christian and Gentile. Such articles as our editorials, the Comments on "Light on the Path," etc., etc.—are not intended for Materialists. They are addressed to Theosophists, or readers who know in their hearts that Masters of Wisdom *do* exist: and, though *absolute* truth is not on earth and has to be searched for in higher regions, that there still are, even on this silly, ever-whirling little globe of ours, some things that are not even dreamt of in Western philosophy.

To return to our subject. It thus follows that, though "general *abstract* truth is the most precious of all blessings" for many of us, as it was for Rousseau, we have, meanwhile, to be satisfied with relative truths. In sober fact, we are a poor set of mortals at best, ever in dread before the face of even a relative truth, lest it should devour ourselves and our petty little preconceptions along with us. As for an absolute truth, most of us are as incapable of seeing it as of reaching the moon on a bicycle. Firstly, because absolute truth is as immovable as the mountain of Mahomet, which refused to disturb itself for the prophet, so that he had to go to it himself. And we have to follow his example if we would approach it even at a distance. Secondly, because the kingdom of absolute truth is not of this world, while we are too much of it. And thirdly, because notwithstanding that in the poet's fancy man is

> ". . . . . the abstract
> Of all perfection, which the workmanship
> Of heaven hath modelled. . . . . ."

in reality he is a sorry bundle of anomalies and paradoxes, an empty wind bag inflated with his own importance, with contradictory and easily influenced opinions. He is at once an arrogant and a weak creature, which, though in constant dread of some authority, terrestrial or celestial, will yet—

---

* *e.g.*, to the little article "Autocentricism"—on the same "philosophy," or again, to the apex of the Hylo-Idealist pyramid in this Number. It is a letter of protest by the learned Founder of the School in question, against a *mistake* of ours. He complains of our "coupling" his name with those of Mr. Herbert Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, and others, on the question of atheism and materialism, as the said lights in the psychological and physical sciences are considered by Dr. Lewins too flickering, too "compromising" and weak, to deserve the honourable appellation of Atheists or even Agnostics. See "Correspondence" in Double Column, and the reply by "The Adversary."

". . . . . like an angry ape,
Play such fantastic tricks before high Heaven
As make the angels weep."

Now, since truth is a multifaced jewel, the facets of which it is impossible to perceive all at once; and since, again, no two men, however anxious to discern truth, can see even one of those facets alike, what can be done to help them to perceive it? As physical man, limited and trammelled from every side by illusions, cannot reach truth by the light of his terrestrial perceptions, we say—develop in you the *inner* knowledge. From the time when the Delphic oracle said to the enquirer "Man, know thyself," no greater or more important truth was ever taught. Without such perception, man will remain ever blind to even many a relative, let alone absolute, truth. Man has to *know himself, i.e.,* acquire the *inner* perceptions which never deceive, before he can master any absolute truth. Absolute truth is *the symbol of Eternity,* and no *finite* mind can ever grasp the eternal, hence, no truth in its fulness can ever dawn upon it. To reach the state during which man sees and senses it, we have to paralyze the senses of the external man of clay. This is a difficult task, we may be told, and most people will, at this rate, prefer to remain satisfied with relative truths, no doubt. But to approach even terrestrial truth requires, first of all, *love of truth for its own sake,* for otherwise no recognition of it will follow. And who loves truth in this age for its own sake? How many of us are prepared to search for, accept, and carry it out, in the midst of a society in which anything that would achieve success *has to be built on appearances, not on reality, on self-assertion, not on intrinsic value*? We are fully aware of the difficulties in the way of receiving truth. The fair heavenly maiden descends only on a (to her) congenial soil—the soil of an impartial, unprejudiced mind, illuminated by pure Spiritual Consciousness; and both are truly rare dwellers in civilized lands. In our century of steam and electricity, when man lives at a maddening speed that leaves him barely time for reflection, he allows himself usually to be drifted down from cradle to grave, nailed to the Procrustean bed of custom and conventionality. Now conventionality—pure and simple—is a congenital LIE, as it is in every case a "*simulation* of feelings according to a received standard" (F. W. Robertson's definition); and where there is any simulation *there cannot be any truth.* How profound the remark made by Byron, that "truth is a gem that is found at a great depth; whilst on the surface of this world all things are weighed *by the false scales of custom,*" is best known to

those who are forced to live in the stifling atmosphere of such social conventionalism, and who, even when willing and anxious to learn, dare not accept the truths they long for, for fear of the ferocious Moloch called Society.

Look around you, reader; study the accounts given by the world-known travellers, recall the joint observations of literary thinkers, the data of science and of statistics. Draw the picture of modern society, of modern politics, of modern religion and modern life in general before your mind's eye. Remember the ways and customs of every cultured race and nation under the sun. Observe the doings and the moral attitude of people in the civilized centres of Europe, America and even of the far East and the colonies, everywhere where the white man has carried the "benefits" of so-called civilization. And now, having passed in review all this, pause and reflect, and then name, *if you can,* that blessed *Eldorado,* that exceptional spot on the globe, *where* TRUTH *is the honoured guest, and* LIE *and* SHAM *the ostracised outcasts*? YOU CANNOT. Nor can any one else, unless he is prepared and determined to add his mite to the mass of falsehood that reigns supreme in every department of national and social life. "Truth!" cried Carlyle, "truth, though the heavens crush me for following her, no falsehood, though a whole celestial Lubberland were the prize of Apostasy." Noble words, these. But how many think, and how many will *dare* to speak as Carlyle did, in our nineteenth century day? Does not the gigantic appalling majority prefer to a man the "paradise of Do-nothings," the *pays de Cocagne* of heartless selfishness? It is this majority that recoils terror-stricken before the most shadowy outline of every new and popular truth, out of mere cowardly fear, lest Mrs. Harris should denounce, and Mrs. Grundy condemn, its converts to the torture of being rent piecemeal by her murderous tongue.

SELFISHNESS, the first-born of Ignorance, and the fruit of the teaching which asserts that for every newly-born infant a new soul, *separate and distinct* from the Universal Soul, is "created"—this Selfishness is the impassable wall between the *personal* Self and Truth. It is the prolific mother of all human vices, *Lie* being born out of the necessity for dissembling, and *Hypocrisy* out of the desire to mask *Lie.* It is the fungus growing and strengthening with age in every human heart in which it has devoured all better feelings. Selfishness kills every noble impulse in our natures, and is the one deity, fearing no faithlessness or desertion from its votaries. Hence, we see it reign supreme in the world, and in so-called fashionable society. As a result, we live, and move, and have our

being in this god of darkness under his trinitarian aspect of Sham, Humbug, and Falsehood, called RESPECTABILITY.

Is this Truth and Fact, or is it slander? Turn whichever way you will, and you find, from the top of the social ladder to the bottom, deceit and hypocrisy at work for dear Self's sake, in every nation as in every individual. But nations, by tacit agreement, have decided that selfish motives in politics shall be called "noble national aspiration, patriotism," etc.; and the citizen views it in his family circle as "domestic virtue." Nevertheless, Selfishness, whether it breeds desire for aggrandizement of territory, or competition in commerce at the expense of one's neighbour, can never be regarded as a virtue. We see smooth-tongued DECEIT and BRUTE FORCE—the *Jachin* and *Boaz* of every International Temple of Solomon—called Diplomacy, and we call it by its right name. Because the diplomat bows low before these two pillars of national glory and politics, and puts their masonic symbolism "in (cunning) strength shall this my house be established" into daily practice; *i.e.,* gets by deceit what he cannot obtain by force—shall we applaud him? A diplomat's qualification—"dexterity or skill in securing advantages" —for one's own country at the expense of other countries, can hardly be achieved by speaking *truth,* but verily by a wily and deceitful tongue; and, therefore, LUCIFER calls such action—a *living,* and an evident LIE.

But it is not in politics alone that custom and selfishness have agreed to call deceit and lie virtue, and to reward him who lies best with public statues. Every class of Society lives on LIE, and would fall to pieces without it. Cultured, God-and-law-fearing aristocracy being as fond of the forbidden fruit as any plebian, is forced to lie from morn to noon in order to cover what it is pleased to term its "little peccadillos," but which TRUTH regards as gross immorality. Society of the middle classes is honeycombed with false smiles, false talk, and mutual treachery. For the majority religion has become a thin tinsel veil thrown over the corpse of spiritual faith. The master goes to church to deceive his servants; the starving curate—preaching what he has ceased to believe in—hood-winks his bishop; the bishop—his God. *Dailies,* political and social, might adopt with advantage for their motto Georges Dandin's immortal query—"Lequel de nous deux trompe-t-on ici?"—Even Science, once the anchor of the salvation of Truth, has ceased to be the temple of *naked* Fact. Almost to a man the Scientists strive now only to force upon their colleagues and the public the acceptance of some personal hobby, of some new-fangled theory, which will shed

lustre on their name and fame. A Scientist is as ready to suppress damaging evidence against a current scientific hypothesis in our times, as a missionary in heathen-land, or a preacher at home, to persuade his congregation that modern geology is a lie, and evolution but vanity and vexation of spirit.

Such is the actual state of things in 1888 A.D., and yet we are taken to task by certain papers for seeing this year in more than gloomy colours!

Lie has spread to such extent—supported as it is by custom and conventionalities—that even chronology forces people to lie. The suffixes A.D. and B.C. used after the dates of the year by Jew and Heathen, in European and even Asiatic lands, by the Materialist and the Agnostic as much as by the Christian, at home, are—a *lie* used to sanction another LIE.

Where then is even relative truth to be found? If, so far back as the century of Democritus, she appeared to him under the form of a goddess lying at the very bottom of a well, so deep that it gave but little hope for her release; under the present circumstances we have a certain right to believe her hidden, at least, as far off as the ever invisible *dark* side of the moon. This is why, perhaps, all the votaries of hidden truths are forthwith set down as lunatics. However it may be, in no case and under no threat shall LUCIFER be ever forced into pandering to any universally and tacitly recognized, and as universally practised lie, but will hold to fact, pure and simple, trying to proclaim truth whensoever found, and under no cowardly mask. Bigotry and intolerance may be regarded as orthodox and sound policy, and the encouraging of social prejudices and personal hobbies at the cost of truth, as a wise course to pursue in order to secure success for a publication. Let it be so. The Editors of LUCIFER are Theosophists, and their motto is chosen: *Vera pro gratiis.*

They are quite aware that LUCIFER's libations and sacrifices to the goddess Truth do not send a sweet savoury smoke into the noses of the lords of the press, nor does the bright "Son of the Morning" smell sweet in their nostrils. He is ignored when not abused as—*veritas odium paret.* Even his friends are beginning to find fault with him. They cannot see *why it should not be a purely Theosophical magazine,* in other words, why it refuses to be dogmatic and bigoted. Instead of devoting every inch of space to theosophical and occult teachings, it opens its pages "to the publication of the most grotesquely heterogeneous elements and conflicting doctrines." This is the chief accusation, to which we answer—why

not? Theosophy is divine knowledge, and knowledge is Truth; every *true* fact, every sincere word are thus part and parcel of Theosophy. One who is skilled in divine alchemy, or even approximately blessed with the gift of the perception of truth, will find and extract it from an erroneous as much as from a correct statement. However small the particle of gold lost in a ton of rubbish, it is the noble metal still, and worthy of being dug out even at the price of some extra trouble. As has been said, it is often as useful to know what a thing *is not,* as to learn what it *is.* The average reader can hardly hope to find any fact in a sectarian publication under all its aspects, *pro* and *con,* for either one way or the other its presentation is sure to be biased, and the scales helped to incline to that side to which its editor's special policy is directed. A Theosophical magazine is thus, perhaps, the only publication where one may hope to find, at any rate, the unbiased, if still only approximate truth and fact. Naked truth is reflected in LUCIFER under its many aspects, for no philosophical or religious views are excluded from its pages. And, as every philosophy and religion, however incomplete, unsatisfactory, and even foolish some may be occasionally, must be based on a truth and fact of some kind, the reader has thus the opportunity of comparing, analyzing, and choosing from the several philosophies discussed therein. LUCIFER offers as many facets of the One universal jewel as its limited space will permit, and says to its readers: "Choose you this day who ye will serve: whether the gods that were on the other side of the flood which submerged man's reasoning powers and divine knowledge, or the gods of the Amorites of *custom* and *social falsehood,* or again, the Lord of (the highest) Self—the bright destroyer of the dark power of illusion?" Surely it is that philosophy that tends to diminish, instead of adding to, the sum of human misery, which is the best.

At all events, the choice is there, and for this purpose only have we opened our pages to every kind of contributors. Therefore do you find in them the views of a Christian clergyman who believes in his God and Christ, but rejects the wicked interpretations and the enforced dogmas of his ambitious proud Church, along with the doctrines of the Hylo-Idealist, who denies God, soul, and immortality, and believes in nought save himself. The rankest Materialists will find hospitality in our journal; aye, even those who have not scrupled to fill pages of it with sneers and personal remarks upon ourselves, and abuse of the doctrines of Theosophy, so dear to us. When a journal of *free thought,* conducted by an

Atheist, inserts an article by a Mystic or Theosophist in praise of his occult views and the mystery of Parabrahmam, and passes on it only a few casual remarks, then shall we say LUCIFER has found a rival. When a Christian periodical or missionary organ accepts an article from the pen of a free-thinker deriding belief in Adam and his rib, and passes criticism on Christianity—its editor's faith—in meek silence, then it will have become worthy of LUCIFER, and may be said truly to have reached that degree of tolerance when it may be placed on a level with any Theosophical publication.

But so long as none of these organs do something of the kind, they are all sectarian, bigoted, intolerant, and can never have an idea of truth and justice. They may throw innuendoes against LUCIFER and its editors, they cannot affect either. In fact, the editors of that magazine feel proud of such criticism and accusations, as they are witnesses to the absolute absence of bigotry, or arrogance of any kind in theosophy, the result of the divine beauty of the doctrines it preaches. For, as said, Theosophy allows a hearing and a fair chance to all. It deems no views—if sincere—entirely destitute of truth. It respects thinking men, to whatever class of thought they may belong. Ever ready to oppose ideas and views which can only create confusion without benefiting philosophy, it leaves their expounders personally to believe in whatever they please, and does justice to their ideas when they are good. Indeed, the conclusions or deductions of a philosophic writer may be entirely opposed to our views and the teachings we expound; yet, his premises and statements of facts may be quite correct, and other people may profit by the adverse philosophy, even if we ourselves reject it, believing we have something higher and still nearer to the truth. In any case, our profession of faith is now made plain, and all that is said in the foregoing pages both justifies and explains our editorial policy.

To sum up the idea, with regard to absolute and relative truth, we can only repeat what we said before. *Outside a certain highly spiritual and elevated state of mind, during which Man is at one with the* UNIVERSAL MIND—*he can get nought on earth but relative truth, or truths, from whatsoever philosophy or religion.* Were even the goddess who dwells at the bottom of the well to issue from her place of confinement, she could give man no more than he can assimilate. Meanwhile, every one can sit near that well—the name of which is KNOWLEDGE—and gaze into its depths in the hope of seeing Truth's fair image reflected, at least, on the dark waters. This, however, as remarked by Richter, presents a certain

danger. Some truth, to be sure, may be occasionally reflected as in a mirror on the spot we gaze upon, and thus reward the patient student. But, adds the German thinker, "I have heard that some philosophers in seeking for Truth, to pay homage to her, have seen their own image in the water and adored it instead." . . .

It is to avoid such a calamity — one that has befallen every founder of a religious or philosophical school—that the editors are studiously careful not to offer the reader only those truths which they find reflected in their own personal brains. They offer the public a wide choice, and refuse to show bigotry and intolerance, which are the chief landmarks on the path of Sectarianism. But, while leaving the widest margin possible for comparison, our opponents cannot hope to find *their faces* reflected on the clear waters of our Lucifer, without remarks or just criticism upon the most prominent features thereof, if in contrast with theosophical views.

This, however, only within the cover of the public magazine, and so far as regards the merely intellectual aspect of philosophical truths. Concerning the deeper spiritual, and one may almost say religious, beliefs, no true Theosophist ought to degrade these by subjecting them to public discussion, but ought rather to treasure and hide them deep within the sanctuary of his innermost soul. Such beliefs and doctrines should never be rashly given out, as they risk unavoidable profanation by the rough handling of the indifferent and the critical. Nor ought they to be embodied in any publication except as hypotheses offered to the consideration of the thinking portion of the public. Theosophical truths, when they transcend a certain limit of speculation, had better remain concealed from public view, for the "evidence of things not seen" is no evidence save to him who sees, hears, and senses it. It is not to be dragged outside the "Holy of Holies," the temple of the impersonal divine *Ego,* or the indwelling Self. For, while every fact outside *its* perception can, as we have shown, be, at best, only a relative truth, a ray from the absolute truth can reflect itself only in the pure mirror of its own flame—our highest Spiritual Consciousness. And how can the darkness (of illusion) comprehend the light that shineth in it?

THE ELEMENT OF PERSONALITY

THEOSOPHISTS and other sincere men engaged in studying the problems of human existence soon come to see that the personal element is the prime factor in all differences and disputations over the great questions of life. All men regard these controversies and conflicts as undesirable and injurious, yet by some fatality are very often so fascinated by the notion of destroying evil that they lose sight of their power to turn their energies into the opposite, the creation of the good.

In the world as it is today many of the best minds are afflicted in this way and seek to cure existing and deep-seated evils by some species of violence. Whether profiters by and therefore defenders of "the established order," or reformers who would make use of political surgery or social serumization to ameliorate the condition of the "masses"—they are all one, so long as facts only are dealt with and psychology ignored. One and all they are arguing, contending, prepared or preparing to do battle to enforce their own views, views which are alien and antagonistic, fundamentally irreconcilable physically because metaphysical in origin.

Who seeks to understand his neighbor's point of view, let alone that of minds foreign to his own prevailing notions? Certainly any dispassionate survey of the lessons of all history confirms the Buddha's teaching: "Hatred does not cease by hatred, hatred ceases only by loving." The Sermon on the Mount is but a repetition of the Buddha's gospel, as indeed will be found to be the case with every other Great Teacher.

Until we begin to study human nature itself we are dealing merely with outward, visible effects, and not at all with their invisible, internal cause and causes. The moment we seriously regard human nature, not as something unique to each individual, but common to all alike, and differing only in its manifestations, in that instant we cannot fail to see that human nature is complex indeed. Like magnets, men possess two poles, mutually repellant and mutually attractive, accordingly as they are placed in relation to and with each other. And just as every particle of every magnet likewise possesses its two poles, so with the minds and ideas of men.

ANCIENT LANDMARKS

The Greek Atomists and Sophists

THE last decade of the nineteenth century witnessed the birth-throes of a new scientific era. Prior to that time, matter and electricity were viewed as separate entities, and the atom was considered to be an indivisible particle of matter. The scientists of last century so feared the consequences which might flow from any theoretical subdivision of this ultimate particle that men like Butlerof and Büchner declared that the admission of the divisibility of the atom would lead to a doubt of the very existence of matter itself. In 1888 H. P. Blavatsky boldly asserted that "it is on the illusive nature of matter and the infinite divisibility of the atom that the science of Occultism is built." Furthermore, she warned the scientists that the ultimate division of the atom would resolve matter into *simple centers of force,* thus precluding the possibility of conceiving matter as an *objective* substance. At the same time she predicted that materialistic science would receive a death blow between 1888 and 1897. That prophecy was fulfilled to the letter, for between 1895 and 1897 the discoveries made by Roentgen, Zeeman, the Curies, Lorenz and Thomson gave the world an entirely new conception of both matter and the atom.

Since the dawn of the twentieth century, matter has entirely lost its individuality, becoming "merely an electrical phenomenon," as Paul R. Heyl states in the Smithsonian Institution *Report* for 1935. The atom has been divided and subdivided, each new discovery making it necessary to revise the conception of its structure. The atom of Rutherford, in which electrons revolved like planets around a central nucleus, gave way to the Bohr atom, in which the electrons jumped from orbit to orbit. Finally the atom was turned over to the mathematician. Now that the scientists themselves admit that the atom is an *abstraction,* it has entered the realm of metaphysics, where, fifty years ago, H. P. B. said that it belongs.

Once again science and philosophy are overlapping, as they did in Greece 2,500 years ago. As Waldemar Kaempffert observes, "the mathematical physicist, who once had nothing but contempt for the philosopher because he was not an experimenter, has of necessity become a philosopher himself." As inductive Science corroborates the hypotheses of these early philosophers more and more, may we not hope that it will begin to show a better appreciation of the wisdom of the ancients than it has done in the past?

Modern science has *ended* with the confession that science and philosophy cannot be separated. The Greek scientists of the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. *started* with that assumption. Modern science started with a speck of matter and has traced it back to an immaterial source. The early Greek scientists started with the Source Itself.

The Greek concept of that Primal Source coincides perfectly with the ancient teachings regarding primordial matter, its properties, functions and laws. Hesiod described it as "Chaos" — infinite, boundless, beginningless and endless, an abstraction and at the same time a visible "presence." The Greek Chaos was SPACE filled with darkness, or primordial matter in its *pre-genetic* state. In that condition it was homogeneous, differentiating at the dawn of manifestation and becoming the root of all the forms of matter which would be developed during that period of evolution. This homogeneous matter, however, was not considered as inert and motionless. No mind capable of penetrating into the realm of metaphysics can conceive of absolute, abstract space apart from absolute, abstract motion. The two are as indissolubly united in the realm of the abstract as they are on the phenomenal plane.

Thales of Miletus, the first Greek philosopher of historical times, postulated the existence of primordial matter. His friend and associate Anaximander completed the picture by declaring this primordial matter to be animated by eternal, ceaseless motion. Anaximenes identified this motion with Life itself, asserting that the universe is a *living* organism, every particle of which is endowed with life. As these three men had been initiated into the Mysteries, they naturally considered the atom from the occult point of view—as the first-born of the ever-concealed Cause of all Causes; hence as a center of potential vitality. Being Initiates, they knew the occult teaching concerning the relationship between Space, motion and atoms. Space, in Occultism, is the all-container. Atoms fill the immensity of Space, and in their aggregate *are* that Motion which keeps the wheels of life revolving.

The early Ionian philosophers concerned themselves primarily with the *Source* of the atom. Their successors, the later Ionians, indicated the atomic changes which have been taking place ever since the universe came into being. As Heraclitus said, "Nothing *is;* all is *becoming.*" According to the archaic secret doctrine taught in the Mysteries, the purpose of evolution is for the collective progress of the countless "lives" which are but the out-breathings of the One Life. Hence, during this period of "Ever-Becoming,"

every atom in the manifested universe passes by gradual stages from the formless and intangible down into matter in full generation, and then back again, every stage of transformation bringing it nearer and nearer to the final goal, when it is again absorbed into its original Source, the unconditioned ALL.

This process was described by Anaxagoras, the pupil of Anaximenes and the teacher of Socrates. He taught that rotatory motion was generated by purer atoms forcing the others downwards, the lighter ones at the same time being forced upward. He believed that this circular motion caused the cyclic curve of differentiated elements, in which each element strives to return to the place of its origin. Going still further, he declared that these atoms were not specks of brute matter, but on the contrary were animated by *intelligence,* to which he gave the name of *Nous.* The theory of elemental vortices, therefore, was not first formulated by Galileo and Descartes, but was propounded by Anaxagoras 2,000 years before.

Although the philosophers of the Ionian School paved the way for the later Atomists, the cosmological scheme based upon the atomic theory is usually attributed to Leucippus. Following in the footsteps of his predecessors, Leucippus affirmed that everything can be traced back to Space and the atoms which fill it. He said that although atoms are alike in *essence,* changes arise in their mutual relations. Being the very essence of Motion itself, they are constantly moving, driven by an energy inherent in themselves. This gives rise to a never-ending series of groupings, separations and re-groupings. Rotatory motion, he declared, is produced through the aggregation of these atoms, lateral movement through their collisions, and from these constant permutations and combinations the complex and kaleidoscopic universe came into being.

The gyratory motion of atoms, therefore, appears as one of the oldest concepts of Greek philosophy. When Newton, in 1675, said that "Nature is a circulatory worker, generating fluids out of solids, fixed things out of volatile, subtile out of gross, and gross out of subtile," he was merely repeating what these Greek scientists had taught 2,000 years before he was born.

As there were no mechanical instruments for studying atomic movement in antiquity, how were these Greek scientists able to perceive the circular motion which they so accurately described? As it was beyond the range of physical perception, it is reasonable to suppose that they depended upon the testimony of senses *higher* than the physical. This explanation becomes still more plausible

when we remember that the training of these higher senses formed part of the discipline of the Mysteries.

Every one who has studied the science of Occultism knows that there are seven planes of substance. Six of these planes exist outside of our normal consciousness, beyond the range of our physical senses, in realms other than our three-dimensional space and our divisions of time. If we follow the atoms of the physical plane upward in their transformations, they will reach a point where they pass altogether beyond the range of the physical senses. In *The Secret Doctrine* (I, 633) H. P. B. describes how these atoms appear to the eye of the Seer, whose *super*-physical senses permit him to penetrate into the inter-stellar shoals. These atoms appear to him as dazzling specks of virgin snow seen in radiant sunlight. Their velocity is swifter than thought, more rapid than any eye of sense could follow, and furthermore, *their motion is circular.*

No physical eye will ever see the ultimate atom. Only when the sixth sense is developed—the sense able to perceive the property of matter known as *Permeability*—will the atom be recognized for what it is: a potential center of force, a living point of energy, a tiny universe endowed with consciousness, intelligence and memory. Every atom has seven planes of existence, each plane being governed by its own specific laws of evolution and absorption, visible to one of man's seven senses and cognizable in one of his seven states of consciousness.

Those Greek philosophers who had been initiated into the Mysteries knew the limitations of the physical senses and the impossibility of obtaining *real* knowledge through any of them. The uninitiated believed that the only knowledge possible to man must be acquired through the senses. Thus the thinkers of Greece were divided on the question: Is knowledge one, or are there two forms of knowledge, the one relative and changing, the other absolute and changeless? Democritus of Abdera, who had been instructed by the *Magi,* declared that "there are two forms of knowledge, the true-born and the bastard." To the latter he assigned all forms of knowledge which are acquired through the physical senses. "The true-born," he said, "is quite apart from these." Against this position were ranged a group of men known as the Sophists, who declared that the knowledge which Democritus had described as "bastard" was the only possible truth. Protagoras, their leader, denied that real, changeless knowledge exists, maintaining that "man is the measure of all things." Knowledge differs with every individual, he said, hence "this is true to me and that to thee."

To any one who had been initiated into the Mysteries, such relativism had application only to the phenomenal world. The whole system of Pythagoras was founded upon the idea of an eternal, changeless Unity underlying all diversities. This Unity, being a universal concept, was applied to all particulars, even to knowledge itself. When Plato, who was also an Initiate, came upon the scene, he openly attacked the fallacies of the Sophists. For Plato there was only one object worthy of attainment and that was *real knowledge.* He considered the only genuine philosophers to be those who possessed the knowledge of the *really*-existing in opposition to mere objects of perception; of the *always*-existing in opposition to the transitory; of the *permanently*-existing in opposition to that which waxes and wanes and is alternately generated and destroyed.

Plato was perfectly willing to admit that a certain form of knowledge is obtainable through the senses. He called this knowledge *Perception.* But he declared that another form of knowledge exists which is not derived from the senses. That he called *Real* Knowledge. He agreed with the Sophists that perceptive knowledge does differ with the individual. He emphatically disagreed with their assertion that real knowledge does not exist. He discusses the matter in full detail in his *Protagoras, Sophist* and *Theaetetus,* where he accuses the Sophists of trying to replace the permanent with the transitory, the changeless with the ever changing, and declaring their doctrine to be a perversion, an attempt to supplant true knowledge with mere verisimilitude.

Plato did not originate this idea. Long before his day the Egyptian Hermes had described these two forms of knowledge, and in still earlier times they had been described in the ancient *Stanzas of Dzyan* as *Dzyu* and *Dzyu-mi.*

> Dzyu is the one real (magical) knowledge, or Occult Wisdom; which, dealing with eternal truths and primal causes, becomes almost omniscience when applied in the right direction. Its antithesis is Dzyu-mi, that which deals with illusions and false appearances only, as in our exoteric modern sciences. (*The Secret Doctrine* I, 108.)

It is upon the basis of this latter form of knowledge—which Democritus describes as "bastard," Plato as "Perception," and H. P. B. as the knowledge of illusions and false appearances—that modern science has conducted its experiments and made its deductions. Shall our scientists be blamed for pursuing the only course open to them, since it is no longer possible for them to be initiated into the Mysteries? As H. P. B. pointed out, "outside of such

initiation for every thinker there will be a 'thus far and no farther,' mapped out by his intellectual capacity."

Although the Mysteries of Greece have disappeared, the *real* knowledge upon which they were founded has come down the centuries unchanged. Since the publication of *The Secret Doctrine* in 1888, there has been no longer any need to depend upon "bastard" knowledge, since that book contains all of the real knowledge that is possible to be given to the world in this century. If that book is carefully studied, the noumenal world of Pythagoras, the World of Ideas of Plato, and Kant's World of Things-in-themselves, will be recognized as substantial, practical realities—as scientific facts.

Our present methods of scientific investigation, however far they may lead us, will never reveal the secrets of the universe as they were disclosed in the Mysteries. The daring explorer, who would probe the inmost secrets of Nature, must transcend the narrow limitations of sense, and learn how to transfer his consciousness into the region of noumena and the sphere of primal cause. To accomplish this, he must develop faculties which are still dormant in the majority of the race. The development of those faculties, however, must be accompanied by strict moral discipline and a spirit of altruism which encompasses the whole of Nature.

The science of Occultism is based upon the fact that in every man there is latent a power which can lead him to true knowledge and enable him to deal with universal principles and primal causes. If our scientists would start with universal principles they would discover that the *real* atom does not exist on the physical plane. If they would study the sevenfold constitution of nature and man, they would soon see that the *real* atom is the seventh, or highest principle of a molecular form, just as *Atma* is the seventh, or highest principle of man. *The Secret Doctrine* is filled with valuable hints to scientists. One is found on page 580 of the first volume, where H. P. B. says that "there is but one science that can henceforth direct modern research into the one path which will lead to the discovery of the whole, hitherto occult truth, and it is *chemistry*." The chemistry of which she speaks, however, is not the chemistry of yesterday and today, but the chemistry of the future, which she calls the New Alchemy, or *Metachemistry*.

"LET US ASSUME"

MANY are the unsolved problems of science as well as of religion. While one deals chiefly with the physical and the other with the metaphysical facts of experience and observation, both use the mind as well as the senses, so that the materialist is perforce a psychologist, the spiritualist perforce a materialist.

The materialistic assumption to account for things as they are and the process by which they have reached their present status is called Evolution. The religious assumption for the same phenomena is given the name of Creation. The reasoning power of both is thenceforth employed in the endeavor to unify the facts perceived with the initial assumption. Whoever observes either effort to co-ordinate mind and sense, the physical and the psychical, without himself entering into the arena, cannot fail to perceive that each will reach a foregone conclusion. Whichever the result thus determined, all history shows that in time further facts, originally unknown or unheeded, upset the assumptions and calculations of both. Indeed, one has but to inspect a little more closely to note that the present-day materialism is the outcome or result of medieval religion; to note that present-day science shows many indications of returning (or reverting) to the religious assumption. The great lukewarm mass in its turn can always be observed to assume that its authorities, priestly or practical, are "right."

What is implicit in any and all assumptions, however named, might and should be considered by everyone, because what is implied is far more important than what is expressed. Every attempt to solve any problem implies (*a*) certain universally verified or verifiable facts; (*b*) gaps or "missing links" between the facts; (*c*) that it is possible to bridge these gaps so that the unbroken series of the facts shall be universally verifiable.

Where there is actual knowledge assumption is impossible—precisely as where there is light, darkness is impossible. Everyone recognizes that human knowledge is incomplete, so that all thinking requires assumption as well as facts and the knowledge of them. No physical fact has ever yet been found to be in contradiction to any other, but what has been learned is that our senses often give errant and contradictory reports. Reports to whom or what? To the Perceiver via the Mind, while each man's daily experience shows him that he is as often and surely as seriously deceived by

his mind as by his senses. Yet no actual knowledge has ever yet been found to be in contradiction to any other mental fact. The physical contradictions, then, cannot lie in what is perceived, but in errant sense-vision. So metaphysical contradictions must inhere in errant and defective mind-vision.

These limitations are serious enough as handicaps to the pursuit of facts in either the mind-world or in that of the senses. But their limitations become almost insuperable when efforts are made to reconcile the two worlds of human existence and experience—that is, to unite the facts of both into one body of knowledge. Hence, men are forced to resort to assumptions, and are for the most part content to pursue this method without ever inquiring into the occasion for this necessity. Everyone is aware that action based on sense-perceptions alone leads to anomalous results. But although the senses are in themselves unrelated, so far as we know, everyone is aware that the normal man possesses, in common with the animals, at least five distinct senses. So he checks the evidence of each against the others, and thus obtains more or less accurately unified sense-impressions. These constitute the facts of the physical world, so far as man is concerned. But no one possesses the same accurate knowledge of his mind that he does of his senses. Why not?

Speaking analogically, it would seem clear that thought, will, feeling, memory and imagination, the five mental faculties, correspond with the five physical senses. Just as we get the mental impressions called sensation from the five physical senses, so do we derive from the mental senses those psychical impressions that constitute our ideas, our notions, our convictions, on this or that subject. Sense-impressions convince us of the reality of the objective world. Psychic impressions convince us of the reality of the subjective universe. But whence and what are those impressions which urge us ceaselessly to the assumption that the two worlds are not fundamentally antagonistic but correlative, and so can be reconciled and unified into a common body of truth? What is the urge which drives science to the assumption that matter and force are one? What the urge that drives religion toward the assumption that God and Man, good and evil, life and death, may all be reconciled in terms of unity?

No one can doubt that the reports of the senses are disorderly as well as inaccurate. Who but will admit that his ideas are inaccurate, his mind disorderly? Is it not a proper assumption that the inaccuracy inheres in the disorderliness? That we would do well

to study the nature of the senses and the mind instead of devoting all our attention to the two sets of impressions we receive from them?

In any case, how could anyone ever derive the conviction, whether of the reign of Law or the will of God, from either set of impressions? Whence, then, comes the certainty we have of either Law or God? Whence what we call fact, knowledge, Truth? Yet every man has these convictions and their correlatives—that there is purposiveness, cause and effect, continuity, in all the operations of Nature; in short, that there must of necessity be a rational and moral explanation of existence which will include, correlate, reduce to "law and order," unify, the most irrational and immoral actions and conduct.

Why not, then, assume that the human heart has not yet fully uttered itself, and that we have too long taken it for granted that we understand the extent of its powers—that we know ourselves already? Why not assume that we should be developing new sensibilities and a closer relation with nature, thus enabling us to descry facts and truths beyond our present ken? Why not assume that the Buddha, the Christ, the Sage, the Philosopher, the man of genius, the great discoverers in every field of physical and psychic nature, the hero, the martyr, the philanthropist, have all been men who assumed that there is more in Nature and in Man than other men could even imagine? Why not assume that they knew what they were talking about, and set about profiting by their instruction?

Why not assume that the Great of all time were not so foolish as to spend their lives in the endeavor to teach what it is impossible for us to learn? Why not assume that what we now are, They once were, and that what They now are, we may become, by traveling the route They taught and exemplified? Why not assume that what now seems to us merely Their assumption, can be substantiated, verified, realized by man to be in fact the Way, the Truth, and the Life?

POWER OF IMAGINATION

The idea or the faculty of imagination is both rudder and bridle to the senses, inasmuch as the thing imagined moves the sense. Pre-imagining is the imagining of things that are to be. Post-imagining is the imagining of things that are past.—LEONARDO DA VINCI.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS' FORUM

IF our individual egos have been co-existing with all other beings from all eternity, then each ego has made the same number of incarnations as every other—an infinite series.

(1) Does this not place one on the horns of a dilemma? Either man has already made all progress in the course of his infinite string of rebirths, or he has made none whatsover and can make none. In either case, is this not a purposeless universe?

(2) If there has always been an infinite gradation of egos evolving, either the egos have made no progress by this evolution and are now and will always be in the same position, or new egos must be introduced to keep the infinite gradation intact. By now even the "lowest" ego should be getting along, if he is making progress at all. But if you introduce any new egos you upset infinity. How can these ideas be reconciled?

(*a*) The first question appears to imply that if we as individual egos started the journey of evolution at the same time, then surely in the infinite series of incarnations undergone, we should by this time have made all possible progress. If we have not made *all* progress, it must be that we have made *no* progress, hence the universe is without purpose. Or if we have already made all progress, then likewise the universe has no purpose.

The mistake of trying to understand evolution from the form side (really the idea of separate, individual progress) is a common one. We try to trace the course of evolution from the "lowest" and "smallest" particle of life to the "highest," and this is not possible. We should rather begin with the Ego and take his position as the Evolver, not merely for his own sake, but for the sake of all. There is, ultimately, no private, individual progress. The hall-mark of our individuality is the right—the privilege—to make an individual effort for the progress of the whole. "This one spirit is not divided though it seems to be divided in all creatures, just as the Sun's rays are merely the Sun extended, they do not dissipate when the Sun disappears from our view but are indrawn to the Source from which they came."

Do we then ever lose our individuality? Does return to the source imply an end to the power of coming forth again? The return to the source is not a final act, the end of all possibility of acting, the ultimate end of all comingforths and returnings. When a singer joins a chorus, his voice for the time is merged with the other voices, but the singer retains the power of singing by himself.

He has willingly united his voice with others and knowingly may again withdraw for further individual study and effort to learn. It is evident that nature is trying to teach us something; that inasmuch as our character undergoes constant alteration through experience, there must be somewhere in the great mind of nature a destination, a plan, an intention. To say we see the foundations and the framework of an unfinished house, means we recognize the preparatory work of purposive intelligence. We know that somewhere there is an architect's plan, a blue-print, that there is purpose and design behind every hammer stroke, that no detail is without meaning.

There appears to be a confusion in the questioner's mind as to what it is that progresses. In man, as well as in all other beings, there is that which never changes or progresses. It is the *power* to evolve, to grow. In *That,* and because of *That,* evolution proceeds, but *That* does not change. Matter is the field of evolution, and it, as a *principle,* can progress no more than spirit. There is, however, a principle in man and in all beings, which combines the characteristics of both matter and spirit in that it is both changeless and changing; it is the soul or acquired experience, and it alone progresses. The soul is changeless in the sense that the Self which garners knowledge from experience is the eternal Spirit, the Perceiver. The soul is changing in that it is continually adding to its store of knowledge. It is because of the unchanging in man, however, that she is able to grow in knowledge; for only the permanent can see and relate changes, turning experiences into an understanding of Nature's Law.

Theosophy shows that the One Life, in its own state, cannot know itself because there are no contrasts—all is one with it. The Self knows itself only in the forms and beings which are its mirror, just as we can know what our faces look like only by looking into a mirror. By regarding the mirror of life, each individual ego or spark of the One Life finally learns that Self is not any of its forms, but that it is the Perceiver, the Creator, the Experiencer in and of all forms. The Perceiver is constantly constructing ideals, forms and states, until it finally realizes that all these are comprehended in One, that *all* is Consciousness and Spirit.

Theosophy presents a glorious prospect for each Soul. All men have experienced the exhilaration which comes from using their creative powers: of evolving a plan, of expressing an idea, of painting a picture, of constructing an object. But as a Creator, man has far greater tasks in store for him. As his center of attention changes from his own petty self to that of the Self of all, it is

natural that by degrees he finds in himself the power to act from that universal basis. He desires to help all; nature provides the means for helping all. There is nothing hidden for the one who works on and with nature; with the interests of all at heart, he gradually gains the knowledge and power of all. Perfected Men are thus gradually evolved during a period of evolution, becoming the great beings who guide the evolution of future planets. Such beings take an active part in the government of the natural order of things. As Sages and Great Teachers they point the way for mankind toward the attainment of their own glorious state. But there is no limit to the power of Spirit to create. The attainment of perfection is always relative, because in an infinite universe there are always new heights to be scaled.

Regarding the second part of the question, it is impossible for the "infinite" to be comprehended by finite minds. Nevertheless, infinite *means* "infinite"—no beginning or end. The material world itself shows in every direction that there are no ultimate beginnings or endings. Take a grain of sand and pulverize it. Then take the smallest particle and divide it, and continue the process. When could you stop and say you had found a particle so small that it could not be divided any further? Science now admits the infinite divisibility of matter. Size and distance and degrees of intelligence are entirely relative. The atoms in our body are said to be as far apart from each other, proportionally, as the planets are from the sun. Perhaps to the high knowledge and power of some of the beings in the universe, man's intelligence is atomic by comparison! Of the various beings and intelligences that bring into existence the manifested universe, *The Secret Doctrine* states the following:

> They are the Intelligent Forces that give to and enact in Nature her "laws," while themselves acting according to laws imposed upon them in a similar manner by still higher Powers; but they are not "the personifications" of the powers of Nature, as erroneously thought. This hierarchy of spiritual Beings, through which the Universal Mind comes into action, is like an army—a "Host," truly—by means of which the fighting power of a nation manifests itself, and which is composed of army corps, divisions, brigades, regiments, and so forth, each with its separate individuality or life, and its limited freedom of action and limited responsibilities; each contained in a larger individuality, to which its own interests are subservient, and each containing lesser individualities in itself. (I, 38.)

(*b*) If we accept the presuppositions of these questions, we are indeed on the horns of a dilemma. Theosophy teaches the Presence

of an eternal and changeless principle in man—and in all else. It teaches also that man is an evolving Ego, ever growing and gaining in knowledge and experience through cycles of incarnation. The questioner has arbitrarily identified these conceptions as one, thus rendering manifested existence meaningless. Further, the idea of "all progress" is introduced; again an identification of the abstract ideal of perfection with one of its temporal and relative realizations. It should be obvious that a perfection that is achieved in time can have no relation to the perfection that resides in infinite potentiality. To speak of *all* progress as having been realized somewhere in the course of an infinite string of rebirths is a contradiction in terms. The goal of an infinite course of development must itself be infinite in its possibilities.

The first question suggests that individual egos must, after all, have had a beginning. This may, in one sense, be true; but in another sense is surely false. Is this "begging the question"? No more than saying that in a sense, our solar system had a beginning, but that in another sense the intelligent cause which established the solar system in its present form must have pre-existed in some former and now vanished system, and so on, *ad infinitum*. There is no other way of regarding the fact of manifested nature, unless we choose the theological way of cutting the Gordian knot and postulate an anthropomorphic god who created all out of nothing. But this hypothesis is the most meaningless of all. With a miracle as the basic assumption, every conceivable impossibility becomes quite rational!

Questions dealing with the problem of time and eternity, of unity and diversity, of freedom and necessity—in short, with the ultimate mysteries of life—can not summarily be answered with simple statistics. All such answers may be believed, but they are never *understood*. Theosophy has no room for "beliefs" of any kind, and therefore presents the inquirer with the principles of philosophical investigation, leaving the actual solution to the individual himself. The mystery of the human ego is within each man; its solution is not to be found elsewhere. How can there be any discussion of the "endlessness" or "beginning" of anything, until the essential nature of that "thing" is in some degree realized? And can self-knowledge be printed in books, spoken in words, made plain by revelation of any sort?

Is there then no approach to the solution of these problems in Theosophical philosophy? The entire teaching is such an approach. The principles of all existence are set forth in abstract form, but

they must remain abstract until the individual student realizes their vital reality within his own being. In written or oral discourse, however, these abstractions may be presented in intellectual terms, as the two-dimensional representation of the three-dimensional truth. But that the kind of knowledge that springs in the heart—that constitutes *wisdom*—can be so communicated, the theosophist would be the first to deny.

The nature of human evolution is in part revealed by the questions raised. They show the power of intellect to ask the questions that only the divine mind can answer—the divinity potential in every man. Only transcendent beings can deal with transcendental questions. If man is not such a being he can never know the truth, about himself or anything else. If man is not himself Deity, the whole of his aspiring thought is a cosmic travesty. What do we suppose *is* the purpose of evolution, if not to make manifest on earth the God within? Such has been the achievement of the Buddhas and Christs of all time. From their example we can learn that the mystery of the human soul is not solved through metaphysical exegesis and disputation, although an intellectual grasp of the principles of things may assist our understanding. There is a life to be lived, the Christ-life, before the knowledge of the Christ can become ours. In Theosophy, *knowing* is *becoming*.

Section 2 of the question implies that Theosophy is a constructed system striving to be "logical," wherein tenets must be varied to achieve the appearance of consistency. Thus "new egos" are spoken of as being, or not being, "introduced." Theosophy should not be so lightly regarded. Its doctrines are not strained here and stretched there to meet the necessities of an arbitrary dialectical development. It appears that the questioner has approached the teaching in a somewhat scholastic frame of mind. This makes an intelligible answer to the question, as stated, extremely difficult. He ignores the impossibility of establishing any logical relation between the infinite and the finite. That the Absolute is beyond all relativity is the first principle of any philosophy worthy of the name. Yet the questioner draws an imaginary line from the infinitely low to the infinitely exalted, then regards one end of the line as being in fact a finite beginning, the other end a finite termination, and supposes that by this verbal device it is possible to relate a single, limited cycle of evolution with the unconditioned source of all. He proceeds to make judgments as to the progress or lack of progress of the beings engaged in this limited cycle, as though the two non-existent ends of his *endless* line had supplied reference points for measuring

the relative positions of these beings. Such methods in a discussion of this kind can introduce nothing but infinite confusion.

Perhaps some accord with the mind of the questioner may be reached by attempting to find a common ground of principle. It is presumed that some idea of Deity is admissable as the axiomatic basis for further considerations. Deity, in Theosophy, is regarded under two aspects; first, as symbolized by Space, unmodifiable, illimitable, and all-pervasive; second, as the prime source of motion —not any particular motion, but the very principle of motion itself. But these words are admittedly only symbols for that which can have no representation, because all symbols, forms, movements, beings and relations are contained in, and therefore less than, IT. The moment we define Deity, all that lies beyond the limits of our definition becomes, *not-Deity,* and Deity is then considered as less than the All. But Deity *is* the All; therefore it can not be defined.

How, then, can we understand the emergence in the One of all the diversities of manifested existence? This is a problem only when we allow the finite conception of an ultimate beginning to slip into our considerations. Time, or rather Eternal Duration, is, like Space, a symbol of the Infinite One. Duration, like Space and Motion, must be recognized as an essential aspect of the Unknowable Reality. There was no "beginning," only cycles of activity and rest. The manifested universe shows forth intelligence. Both the mind of nature and the mind of man are conditioned symbols of Universal Mind—again beyond all relativities of limited knowing.

These various aspects of the Unconditioned Reality are essential postulates of any spiritual philosophy. Like all axioms, they are beyond reason; yet their consequences are entirely reasonable, in metaphysics, and in the ethical rules which Theosophy shows to be the necessary development of these first principles. A study of the great religions of the world in the light of Theosophy reveals that every spiritual Teacher has drawn his knowledge from the same fount of eternal Wisdom; a large portion of the Theosophical writings is devoted to this demonstration.

Thus Theosophy is not offered as an explanation of things which is at once clear and plain in all its recondite aspects. In the nature of things, Truth is not so to be known. The tragedy of religion is that while seeking to answer the questions of life, it makes men believe that answers can be given by someone outside the man himself, that these answers must be believed on authority. The idea that the source of Truth is external to the soul of Man is the worst of all heresies: it is the denial of the god within.

(*c*) What does the questioner mean by "our individual egos"? Strictly speaking, the Ego is Atma-Buddhi-Manas. Essentially each one is Life itself, or Atma. As for the Monad, or Atma-Buddhi, Mr. Judge states that "without the presence of the Monad evolution could not go forward." Manas is a principle in all of Nature, but in Man it must be individually "lighted up." As given in *The Ocean of Theosophy* (p. 53-4):

> The manner in which this light of mind was given to the Mindless Men can be understood from the illustration of one lighted candle and numerous unlighted ones, it follows that from one light the others may also be set aflame. So in the case of *Manas*. . . .
>
> The Sons of Wisdom, who are the Elder Brothers of every family of men on any globe, have the light derived by them from others who reach back, and yet further back, in endless procession with no beginning nor end.

Egos do not have the same number of incarnations. We live on earth to different ages and the experiences each one assimilates are according to individual will and choice. The after-death states differ according to the energy put into thought and imagination that cannot find expression in earth-life. So, the after-death states vary, as Mr. Judge says, from a short length of time to many thousands of years, the average at present being 1,500 years.

While there is no limit to the degrees of intelligence in the Kosmos, in any period of manifestation the number of beings engaged therein is limited. Mr. Judge expresses this idea clearly:

> . . . for each Manvantara or period of manifestation, there is *a definite number of souls or egos* who project themselves into the current of evolution which is to prevail for that period or manvantara. Of course this subject is limitless, and the consideration of the vast number of systems and worlds where the same process is going on with a definite number of egos in each, staggers the minds of most of those who take the subject up. And of course I do not mean to be understood as saying that there is a definite number of egos in the whole collection of systems in which we may imagine evolution as proceeding, for there could be no such definiteness considered in the mass, as this would be the same as taking measure of the Absolute. But in viewing any part of the manifestation of the Absolute, it is allowable for us to say that there are to be found such a definite number of egos in that particular system under consideration; this is one of the necessities of our finite consciousness. (THEOSOPHY I, 540-1.)

KAMADEVA

IT is perhaps natural that the theosophist, in considering the conflicting urges of his own nature in the field of experience called "moral," should tend to classify some of his "principles," the Kamic, for instance, as "bad," and others, the Buddhic, as "good."

Setting aside the important fact that good and evil exist only in relation to one another, the classification of desire in itself as *bad* is in the present age a rather widespread moral instinct in man. But it is dangerous to label anything in such sharp blacks and whites. Making moral values intrinsic in *things* has led innumerable monastics to set up artificial strains in their as yet quite human nature, bringing dire results as the inevitable reaction. Morality cannot be identified with any overt course of action, any *form* of behavior. In Theosophy false asceticism is strongly warned against and condemned: "The self-righteous man makes for himself a bed of mire." That bed of mire is all too frequently the cushion for the fall from excessive holier-than-thou-ness. Why? Because few would-be ascetics have any well-defined program for the helping of mankind as the reason and basis for their discipline. Or if there is such a program, the "savior complex" is usually its foundation.

The vision of one's self as great and pure, with all the imagined spiritual virtues that go with it, is a more dangerous form of the "Heresy of separateness" than is the separateness of the sinner—more dangerous because it goes farther without being discovered by its victim. Ultimately the victim of self-righteousness is led into regions of boundless pride, of contempt and Olympian disdain for every being of lesser purity and even slightly more sinfulness. Such an one, even as the man wholly abandoned to vice, finally spins himself an impenetrable cocoon of spiritual selfishness from which no liberation is possible, except by the terrible rebound of over-strained nature, in this or another life. He may thus come to see his unity with mankind by learning in the gutter what he would not learn on high.

Pride of separateness cannot long be sustained in the abyss of human degradation. The consanguinity of failure is not to be denied. Conventionally one thinks of those for whom vice has an irresistible attraction as having descended to that state by successive degrees of self-indulgence in the past. But signs are not wanting that a weakness for evil can as easily have been due to unnatural or selfish asceticism. Theosophists are not few who have discovered the plain signs of that debacle in themselves, from which they are in

this life slowly recovering, and who may come to a just balance if the old temptations toward either excessive desire or prideful virtue do not again overthrow them. True purity is never personal; so long as one hungers to purge *his* nature, with little thought of weaknesses held in common with his fellows, just so long does he rise only to fall to the bottom once again.

Knowledge of self—an impersonal recognition of *both* the "good" and the "evil" in one's self—means an insight far more profound, and infinitely more terrible, may be, than is fancied by those who idly deem that facing themselves *as they are* would be no great trial, might even be pleasurable. Those to whom self-knowledge comes easily have already passed far beyond any necessity of incarnating in an age as black as this.

The Universe is *one*; the Universe is infinite; it is infinite in its power to generate those combinations which produce in us the sensations of "evil" as well as those which produce the sensation of "good." The currents of evil which flow through individual man are as much part of his road to ultimate unity as are the currents of good, and have to be seen, felt, and understood before the flower of his being comes to full bloom under the universal sun. The one is not to be embraced, nor the other abhorred, *except in the service of an ideal transcending both.* Life's lesson is not of evil and good, but the knowledge which lies beyond all opposites.

Should a man then seek evil as a matter of experience? This is an academic question. If he has not yet learned enough about evil he *will* seek it, and all that law, precept, philosophy or fear can do is to delay his journey to hell for a little while. Nor is there any need for guardians, mentors, or executioners to read him the lessons he has to learn there; his own nature will do that for him in measure heaped up, pressed down, and running over. If then he has learned well, he will have found that not even in the darkest inferno is there anything intrinsically "evil"—no more than the saint can discover "good" in his opposite but corresponding experience of heavenly delights. Saint and sinner, in each man, combining to place their experiences side by side before the Perceiver, show him that there are but three states of the Soul: that of pain, reaching toward infinity in its possibilities; of pleasure, similar in variety and extent—inseparable from and equally balanced with pain in the manifested universe; the third state one of fathomless and timeless bliss, beyond sensation and beyond life, into which can enter only those who have learned enough of the other two states to be through with both of them, having seen them for what they are.

"CHANGING VALUES OF SCIENCE"

II

AFTER reviewing the impact on scientific thought of the principle of indeterminacy, leading, for some, to the rather occult suggestion that the atom has "free will," Dr. Wallace wonders whether scientists are justified in drawing philosophical conclusions from this discovery. Perhaps this is a specious "freedom" deriving from our ignorance of nature's laws. Does the large-scale order of nature somehow result from the mere caprice of nature's units, or will further study reveal the hidden factors of causation behind the unpredictable movement of the electron around its nucleus? Whatever may be the truth of this matter, the fact is that "there has been a general acceptance of the position that a new orientation is needed in our approach to the physical world, and that the scientist must guide himself accordingly."

Dr. Wallace employs the views of three eminent modern thinkers to show the typical positions taken in this new setting by philosophers of science: Arthur Eddington and Herbert Dingle, physical scientists, and the philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead. For Eddington, the statistics of physical phenomena are but symbols of a hidden reality, causality is but the phenomenal aspect of this mystical ground. He accepts indeterminacy as evidence that there is more to mind and matter than the mechanical operation of cause and effect. Whitehead makes a different approach. While Eddington would say to the scientist, "Your method can not penetrate the realm of consciousness," Whitehead regards all nature as a living unity. He would integrate the world of scientist with the larger world of the philosopher. To separate organic from inorganic when inwardly they are one is unjustifiable abstraction. Whitehead's idea seems to be that logical rationality is an intrinsic characteristic of the whole, moving toward an end of esthetic harmony. But this philosopher, as Dr. Wallace implies, is notably obscure. Dingle represents the conservative position. Eddington's subjectivity, he thinks, is inconsistent with the belief that scientific investigation has value, while Whitehead's assumption that nature is an organic and rational whole is without proof. From the field of experience the scientist makes abstractions, which are beyond time and causality. By enlarging these concepts we may some day reach one unifying view which will rationalize the whole of nature. We must not theorize upon the facts, however, but start in the limited areas which present knowledge justifies, withholding judgment as to our destination.

These three views, Dr. Wallace finds, have elements in common, although dissimilar in other respects. He says, in summary:

> It is very evident, in the first place, that the rigidly mechanistic conception of the universe, as it appeared to an earlier generation of scientists, has lost its force today. It is not in the thinking of the men to whom I have referred, nor to others of similar stature who, too, have gone deeply into the subject. This change has taken place partly because scientists are not prepared to insist on the principle of causality in the face of the recent findings in nuclear physics; but mainly because they are doubtful whether the method of the scientist is adequate to determine the whole of the processes of nature, even in the purely physical realm. There are many who would feel that, when further knowledge has been gained, the mechanical principle may yet prove to be the most adequate interpretation. There are few who would take the position that it is the only interpretation of the phenomena of the inanimate and animate world.
>
> In the second place, there is a growing tendency to treat nature as a whole and to make no separation between the inanimate and animate world. Whatever explanation will ultimately be found to be adequate must prove to be adequate for the living and non-living alike. The mechanists endeavored to apply this principle to the whole of nature, and in so doing reduced man to an automaton. Freedom of choice disappeared in the process; and reason has rebelled against this explanation of the springs of our being. But it is felt that there must be a principle of rational operation of the world, and that man in all his activities, physical, intellectual, spiritual, will be found to fit into the plan as well as does the growing crystal. If there is not a closed system self-determining and working as does a machine, there must be a rational system, which the mind of man may yet be able to understand. The philosopher assumes that such a comprehensive system exists; the scientist feels that the proven area of rational operation is widening, and may some day include the universe in its scope.
>
> These two positions, which seem to be representative of the thinking of our time, namely, that the mechanistic conception of the world is inadequate and that there will in all likelihood be found to be a rational basis applying to the inanimate and animate world alike—these positions have been taken because of a sense of values which has found inadequate interpretation under the old régime.

It may be noted as significant that the emphasis is on esthetic values, in both Eddington and Whitehead. Possibly this is in instinctive avoidance of the moral problem because of its theological associations. A fine mind naturally dislikes to discuss even by analogy the issues which the bible-pounders have put in so unlovely a dress. But that the problem of good and evil has suffered at the

hands of bigots in no wise alters the fact that it is central to all other considerations and must therefore be faced. A philosophy of purpose does not become unnecessary because theology has made teleology unpopular, nor is the ideal of a brotherhood of man any the less needed because it has suffered from unworthy mouthings. Yet. Dr. Wallace's esthetic appreciation of the goal of life is not exclusive of these ideas:

> The quality of beauty resides in the essential fitness of things themselves, as in the mind attuned to perceive that fitness. The deeper values are universal, in and through nature, of which man is only a part. It is the great task of science to integrate these eternal values into a rational whole with the external phenomena of nature with which science has been hitherto more immediately concerned. Ultimately there can be no conflict; there can not even be a dualism. If truth has any meaning, it is that there is one truth, expressed it may be through many aspects, but blending into a unified whole. The tools adequate for the work of delving for this comprehensive truth must be shaped for the hands both of the scientist and the philosopher, for they must work together in this great quest.

Dr. Wallace now asks the great question: Do we need more science of the kind we already know, or should we turn to other sources to fill the gap between our present knowledge and the pressing problems of the day?

> In the need for clearer thought as to ultimate values which we call good, whether in personal or social relationships, whether as formulated by legislation or by an inner moral law which finds no expression in words, can we advance to clearer criteria by the well-tried method which science has so successfully pursued elsewhere, or must we always be content to say, as the Earl of Listowel has recently said: "Here we turn for guidance, not to science but to the beating of our own hearts and to those great books of poetry, philosophy, and religion in which the finest of men have recorded what life could give in its highest, and happiest and most vivid moments. The sixth book of Plato's Republic, the thirteenth chapter of St. Paul's first letter to the people of Corinth, the Sermon preached by Jesus on the Mount—such brief communications as these are a better training-ground for those who would direct the affairs of nations than all the voluminous writings of Einstein, a Pavlov, or a Freud"?

However much science may learn about the "how" of things, the question of "why" still remains unanswered. Dr. Wallace refers to the late William McDougall—in whom the world of scientific thought has lost one of its noblest representatives—as having pointed out that to solve the problems of values we must define our ends, for the end determines all the values along the way. Every

choice of man involves a "value-judgment," which must be made whether or not he has a conscious philosophy of life. Yet the scientist, Dr. Wallace says,

> . . . has been concerned with the "how." He has confined himself to it. He has achieved great success in it. But he is beginning to realize that, somehow, the "how" and the "why" are inextricably bound up together, and the answer to the one involves an answer to the other. Ends and means are tied up in the same bundle of life. If he can deal with means alone as a scientist he must deal with ends as a man; but he would wish to use his ability and technique as a scientist in the whole field, and not in a part.

The difficulty is perhaps greater than Dr. Wallace perceives. In every scientific description of the how of things there lies a prejudicial although unspoken "why" bearing the overtones of materialism. Even the denial of the materialistic implications of his doctrine by a scientific philosopher is unable to prevent a consistent development of his own first principles. Take for example the statements of Charles Darwin and Thomas Huxley on the subject of human evolution. Darwin wrote A. R. Wallace that under the law of the survival of the fittest, "the struggle between races of men depends entirely on intellectual and moral qualities." Huxley in his famous essay, "Evolution and Ethics," affirmed that "Cosmic evolution may teach us how the good and the evil tendencies of man may have come about; but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before . . . the ethical progress of society depends not upon imitating the cosmic process, still less in running away from it, but in combating it." Almost as an afterthought, both Darwin and Huxley set up these ethical principles as an act of philosophic faith, imagining, it seems, that they could stand against the enormous weight of the "scientific" arguments to support the theory that evolution is the result of the blind forces of matter. But ethical significance can not suddenly be read into the cosmic process whenever it seems necessary or convenient. The sanctions for a moral order must be more solidly grounded in reality. The ethical ideas of the emergent evolutionists are as anthropomorphically conceived as were the scientific speculations of medieval theologians. Science and ethics must proceed *hand in hand from the beginning.* Any separation of the two leads inevitably to the development of theories of life which are fundamentally incompatible, one with the other and both with the experiences of life itself.

In the last century theology suffered the inexorable fate of its own intellectual and moral decay. Science now has the opportunity

to avoid a similar fate, if it will assume the responsibility of self-criticism and honest confession of ignorance. First, the concealed metaphysics of positivism must be brought out into the open. Scientists must admit that the assumptions of mechanism are wholly unjustified and recognize the bias which they have given all modern study of social problems. They must become fully conscious that scientists, no more than the man in the street, have discovered the ultimate "why" of things, stop posing as authorities in any connection except that of specialized techniques, and participate in a modern democracy of ideas from the same "givens" of experience available to the rest of mankind. It is in this spirit, or something like it, that Dr. Wallace concludes his address:

> The time has come, in my judgment, to question the value of the large amount of time which those who are not to be scientists spend in the laboratories of our modern universities. It is not improbable that more might be gained by observation of the method and the enthusiasm of the able teacher of science. But that method and that enthusiasm must in some measure be imparted to all who are to take their share in the work of our modern world.
>
> The second consideration—and it is even more fundamental—is that this kind of education is not enough for our time. It is imperative that the young scientist should know something of the problems of the psychologist, the philosopher, the economist, the sociologist and the statesman. Not that he should be familiar with the details of those vast fields; that is not humanly possible. But it is possible, and it is necessary, that he familiarize himself with one of the realms of human relationships and feelings, in order that he may place his science in its setting for modern needs. The value and the influence of the man who works completely apart from, and without knowledge of, the deeper movements of mankind, grows less with the passing years; for he at least will play no part in that widening influence which science must exert on the solution of the problems which confront the human race. In this matter we are in grave danger. One contemplates with disquiet and apprehension the increasing stream of narrow specialists who issue from the institutions of learning into a world that is seeking for other counsel than they can give. We need the men who are imbued with the scientific spirit and who have access to the inner courts of the temple of the mind and the spirit of man. That kind of man must be cultivated in our halls of learning. Can it be that we are failing in our task?
>
> We go forward in the faith that truth is universal, and that ever-widening areas will be mapped and explored. It is a small island from which we set out to chart that great sea. If science is to be our instrument, it must be capable of meeting heavy demands. For we will voyage into the infinite, beyond the last horizon.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Scientific "Idiot's Delight"

A. J. Cronin, author of the recent popular novel, *The Citadel,* tells in *This Week* for April 9, "Why I Believe in God." Dr. Cronin nowhere explains what he understands by this term, but it is quite plain that the circumstances and events which led him to this belief gave no evidences of the existence of a *personal* deity. He describes a lecture attended in his student days:

> The lecturer traced the origin of the earth, of the terrestrial spheres, of the solar system, and, I fancy, of every other system, out of the primal darkness by no other guidance, by nothing, it appeared, but the laws of the kinogenetic energy of meteors.
>
> It was a brilliant performance. And at the end of it a little man in the andience stood up.
>
> He congratulated the speaker on his *tour de force.* But, he added mildly, for himself, fantastic though it might be, the Theory of Creation remained the more credible.

This is the position the English novelist has adopted. "I refuse to admit," he says, "that we are the victims of a cosmos governed by the crazy gang of an uncelestial Idiot's Delight." His attitude is something like that of Disraeli toward the controversy over Darwinism, who disposed of the issue by an epigram: "The question is: Is man an ape or an angel? My Lord, I am on the side of the angels." If we have to choose between the solutions offered by Christianity and materialism, all intelligent men must remain agnostics. The question is today on much the same footing as in the time of H. P. B. She wrote in *The Secret Doctrine:*

An Impossible Choice

> The pendulum of thought oscillates between extremes. Having now finally emancipated herself from the shackles of theology, Science has embraced the opposite fallacy; and in the attempt to interpret Nature on purely materialistic lines, she has built up that most extravagant theory of the ages—the derivation of man from a ferocious and brutal ape. So rooted has this doctrine, in one form or another, now become, that the most Herculean efforts will be needed to bring about its final rejection. The Darwinian anthropology is the incubus of the ethnologist, a sturdy child of modern Materialism, which has grown up and acquired increasing vigour, as the ineptitude of the theological legend of Man's "creation" became more and more apparent. It has thriven on account of the strange delusion

that—as a scientist of repute puts it—"All hypotheses and theories with respect to the rise of man can be reduced to *two* (the Evolutionist and the Biblical exoteric account). . . . There is no other hypothesis conceivable. . . . " ! ! The anthropology of the secret volumes is, however, the best possible answer to such a worthless contention. (II, 689.)

"THE DOCK OF LIFE"

Dr. Cronin's first intuitions of another than material reality came to him during his early years as a physician.

As I went about my daily work in a poor slum practice, visiting the sick, trying to help unwashed urchins stricken with pneumonia and wretched old women dying in deepest agony of cancer, I became aware, almost against my will, of strange forces, of intangible and inconsidered vibrations that could not be recorded in any laboratory and could not be explained away.

I saw something of human conduct in the dock of life; of pain, endurance, fortitude; of hope and charity and inextinguishable faith. And in particular I saw something of the strange phenomenon of death.

I recollect, even to this day, an experience of these early years that touched me like a burning brand. I was acting as medical officer to a small fever hospital, in that same poverty-ridden area to which I have referred, when one day there was admitted a child suffering from laryngeal diphtheria.

The child, a little boy of five, was desperately ill, blue in the face and choking, and it was necessary to perform an immediate operation.

I operated myself, nervously and unskilfully, yet with unexpected success, in the bare isolation ward of the hospital.

But although the child was now able to breathe quite peacefully, the toxins of the disease had gained a strangle hold upon his constitution.

Within twenty-four hours he began to sink and in spite of all that we could do we saw that he would not recover.

Perhaps because it was my first such operation I took an exceptional interest in the case. I sat by the dying child's bedside late into the night—watching his life ebb away.

FLIGHT OF THE SOUL

It was a sad vigil. And when at last he died I was conscious of a strange spiritual experience.

At the instant of his death, as he exhaled his final breath, I felt, with positive and terrifying reality, an actual sense of passage in that dim little side room.

> I had often heard death compared to falling asleep, to a physical drop into oblivion. This was neither. This was a soaring transit, both mystical and real. And I, its witness, felt upon my cheek the breath of the Eternal.
>
> All this might be attributed to my imagination, to overstrained nerves, to a morbid susceptibility resulting from my interest in the child. I do not think so. The reaction was too deep, too unexpected for that.
>
> Later in life I was to meet a famous physician who told me that in all his years of practice he had never sat beside a deathbed without experiencing, in some degree, the sensation that had been mine.
>
> He called it, unashamedly, the flight of the soul. But then, he was a very old man. And a very sentimental one.

Unfortunately, belief in the soul *is* regarded as sentimental by the great majority of professional men, and this may be the major cause of modern medicine's inability to cope with our increasing bodily and mental ills. True physicians like Alexis Carrel and Sir Auckland Geddes are far too few. The training received by the medical student is of a kind that renders the mind coarse and impermeable to the evidences of a transcendental life such as Dr. Cronin experienced.

Indians on Man's Constitution

An especially interesting account of the beliefs of American Indians respecting the soul was recently given by Paul Coze, distinguished French ethnologist, who spoke at the Heard Museum in Phoenix, Ariz. The following summary is condensed from a report in the Arizona *Republic* for Jan. 14:

> Each individual is composed of three parts, the body, the soul and the "orenda," and these three must be in perfect balance. The "orenda" of the Indian is, in its simplest terms, his magic power or his vibration, his intuition, that thing which enables him to know events and circumstances many miles distant without human communication. It is the power which the medicine man exerts in carrying out his ceremonials in healing the sick in which he employs, also, the "orenda" of his rattle and the herbs which he uses.
>
> The "orenda" of the sand plays an important part in the Navajo sand paintings, too. For the Indian believes that everything is alive—not just those things which the white man considers alive, such as the human beings, animals and trees, but the earth itself, the rocks and other inanimate objects, and he believes those emanations from these things, if properly employed, can have beneficial effects.

An Indian's account of the "orenda" is given in the words of Mr. Coze:

> "A man's wife is sick, and as the man is leaving his office to go home, his thoughts are of his sick wife, and his 'orenda' is with her. He meets a man on the street and stops to talk to him a moment, but the conversation makes no impression on him because he is not a hundred per cent there. Part of him is with his wife. The next day he has forgotten the conversation because his memory was affected by the absence of part of his 'orenda'."

THE "ORENDA" AFTER DEATH

The report continues with indirect quotation from Mr. Coze:

> Love was explained, according to the Indian interpretation, as sickness, because when a young man is in love with a maiden, he is "not all there," since part of his thoughts, or his "orenda," are with the maiden. That was the explanation for absent-mindedness in lovers, and their day-dreaming at times.
>
> The "orenda" may be explained, Indian-wise, as an aura all around the body, but principally about the head.
>
> An explanation for many of the elaborate funerary ceremonials comes easily when the "orenda" is understood. For the "orenda" does not die when the body dies. It may die in four days, or in many months, but it must be fed and cared for until it does die, and is cared for and revered in ceremonial until its life span is completed.
>
> Another interesting manifestation of the Indians' belief in their "orenda" was the explanation given him by a member of one of the northern tribes. When they go into the woods to hunt moose, they must not think too much of the moose itself lest their "orendas" go out and reach the animal and warn him of the hunter's approach. If they do think too strongly of hunting, the moose will be gone. So, to insure good hunting, they look at the trees, the little animals, and the other things in the woods and come suddenly upon their prey.

AN OCCULT FRAGMENT

It seems plain that the Indian *orenda* is a term comprehensive of the various functions and powers of the psychic nature. The part it plays in healing suggests the magnetic fluid of the mesmerist; other phases of its activity are reminiscent of the teaching respecting the *mayavi rupa,* while its survival of physical death for a time indicates the *kama rupa.* Clearly, the idea of the "orenda" is an important fragment of the occult doctrine which must have been known in its entirety to the ancient ancestors of the American tribes.

"Handwriting Psychologist"

Life for March 27 prints specimens of the handwriting of eight persons prominent in public life, giving the analyses of character which Dr. Artur Holz, Viennese psychologist, reads from the script. Following is *Life's* introductory note:

> A hastily written *z*, a rambling *m* is all that Dr. Artur Holz needs to find evidence that may send men to jail. Claiming to be the only handwriting psychologist in the world, he was until recently connected with the Vienna juvenile court and police department, world-famed for its experimental criminology. He can tell the personality of a person from a small specimen of handwriting with almost frightening accuracy.
>
> On these two pages Dr. Holz analyzes specimens of handwriting that Life gave him. Dr. Holz was not told the identities of the writers and Life made certain that the writing gave no clue. Instead of giving him a sample of the Pope's hand written in the usual Latin or Italian, for example, he was given a sample that the Pope had written in English, which made no reference to anything religious. He was simply told the age of each subject and whether the person was man or woman.
>
> After scrutinizing each sample from various angles, Dr. Holz rewrote a few of the words in order to feel the rhythm of the original writer. For the rest he relied almost wholly upon his uncanny intuition, bolstered by years of psychological study under Freud, Jung and Adler. Proceeding from the premise that a person's personality is unconsciously mirrored in his handwriting, he presented the startling analyses below.

Some Illustrations

The handwriting of the new Pope, Dr. Holz said, indicated a man who

> . . . has labored under incredible conditions of self-discipline during his lifetime. His greatest strength lies in his great ability to set himself a goal and then to bend all his energies towards achieving it. He is undoubtedly a leader of men. As a born diplomat, he is able to make opponents believe he is sympathetic towards their ideas. But in reality he only allows these ideas to impress him if they do not violate any of his own dogmas.

Other analyses are equally acute. From President Roosevelt's hand Dr. Holz divined that "The writer probably suffers from a paralytic body ailment. . . . He seems suited to oratory, especially in politics. His thoughts are idealistic and not always translatable into reality." Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes' writing revealed a man who throughout life "has borne great responsibilities without

getting nervous about them." Joe Louis, heavyweight champion boxer, "cannot be overestimated as an opponent, because he is willing to pursue his brutal course ruthlessly, regardless of consequences either to himself or others, until he finally succeeds in winning exactly what he wants."

But is it merely from an examination of written characters that Dr. Holz is able to give such astonishingly accurate portrayals of the writers? The "uncanny intuition" which the *Life* editors attribute to him is more likely a species of psychometry, the writing furnishing him with a connection with the psychic nature of its author, through which Dr. Holz obtains a "feeling" of the former's character, which he then supposes to be based on the configuration of the script. His ability is no more a matter of lines, curves and angles on paper than are the palmist's conclusions, when correct, simply an interpretation of the wrinkles in the subject's hand, although these may provide clues and a focus for concentration.

Precious Life of Ideas

A thoughtful editorial in *Nature,* British magazine of science (Jan. 14), turns to John Milton's *Areopagitica* for a text on the freedom of thought. The great English poet wrote:

> As good almost kill a man as kill a good book; who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself; kills the image of God, as it were, in the eye. . . . We should be wary, therefore, what persecution we raise against the living labours of public men, how we spill that seasoned life of man, preserved and stored up in books; since we see a kind of homicide may be thus committed, sometimes a martyrdom; and if it extend to the whole impression, a kind of massacre, whereof the execution ends not in the slaying of an elemental life, but strikes at the ethereal and fifth essence, the breath of reason itself; slays an immortality rather than a life.

The "Fifth Essence"

The editorial proceeds to approve of the recent order of U. S. Secretary of State Cordell Hull establishing in his Department a "Division of Cultural Relations" to foster international co-operation "in the field of music, art, literature and other intellectual and cultural attainments." The quotation is apropos, for such relations among the nations of the world assist the cause of intellectual freedom. But exceedingly more important for the end in view is a serious consideration of the real meaning of the words, "fifth essence," which Milton calls "the breath of reason itself." They

are a literal translation of the Latin, *quint essentia*—"the fifth or last and highest essence or power in a natural body." In other words, the fifth essence is the divine Ether of the ancient Pythagoreans, the intelligent mind-principle ensouling bodies compounded of the four lower elements of earth, air, fire, and water. When in English we speak of the "quintessence" of a man, we are actually referring to his Manasic or fifth principle. For the ancients, the sixth and seventh principles remained secrets of the sanctuaries; hence, the fifth was said to be the highest.

Milton's Sources

Milton was steeped in the blend of Neoplatonism and Cabalism of his period. These two influences of occult thought had met in the Italian genius of the revival of learning in Florence, Pico della Mirandola, spreading over the European world through many channels. Denis Saurat, in *Milton: Man and Thinker* (New York: Dial Press, 1925), relates that Milton studied the *Zohar* in the Aramean text. According to the biographer:

> . . . . Milton evidently took only what suited him from that chaos of ideas. But Milton used the *Zohar,* found there abundant confirmation of his general ideas, and drew thence many of the ideas which seem at first most particularly his own. . . . But some of Milton's most original notions are found only in the *Zohar,* and the most striking fact of all is that in the *Zohar* can be found all Milton's ideas, whether apparently peculiar to himself or not. . . . Inversely, although Milton took from the *Zohar* only a very small part of its contents, there is really but one great idea of the *Zohar* which is not in Milton: the idea of reincarnation. Even in this case, however, there is a parallel conception in the poet (p. 282).

A Dark Contrast

Yet with all this knowledge of the very sources of Christianity, Milton could affirm the bloody doctrines of Calvinism with perfervid zeal. Writing *Of Reformation in England,* he gave a horrifying account of the fate of corrupt prelates. Taine introduces the passage—"Hell in hand, Milton menaces; he is drunk with justice and vengeance amid the abysses which he opens and the brands which he wields":

> They shall be thrown downe eternally into the *darkest* and *deepest Gulfe* of Hell, where, under the *despightfull controule,* the trample and spurne of all the other *Damned,* that in the anguish of their *Torture* shall have no other ease than to exer-

> cise a *Raving* and *Bestiall Tyranny* over them as their *Slaves* and *Negros,* they shall remaine in that plight for ever, the *basest,* the *lowermost,* the *most dejected,* most *underfoot,* and *downe-trodden Vassals* of *Perdition.*

The mystery of Milton is not greater than the mystery of the benevolent warriors for freedom in the present day. Milton could in one breath give voice to the noblest ideals of the human heart, with the next spout sulphurous fumes from the nethermost hell. Our scientists speak movingly of the glories of the human mind, and then derive it from a bestial ape, invoking blind Force and dead Matter as the parents of all. The Fifth Essence is long in breaking loose from these bonds of sacerdotalism and materialism.

ESP—Pro and Con

Dr. Henry C. Link, director of the Psychological Service Center in New York City, recently condemned Dr. J. B. Rhine's experimental investigation of psychic powers in man, telepathy in particular, as a "perfect example of modern emotionalism disguised by a scientific vocabulary and machinery." (New York *Herald-Tribune,* Feb. 16.) Dr. Link argues that even the sympathizers with the Duke admit that

> . . . in order to prove the existence of extra-sensory perception one must virtually believe in it before the beginning of the experiments. In other words, it won't work if you don't believe it already. That would be just like saying that "I don't believe in physics" and that physics then would not be true. That is not science.

Telepathy, it may be observed, is itself a phenomenon of sympathy. To prove telepathy to Dr. Link on the basis that he demands would be like attempting to demonstrate the laws of mathematics without the use of numbers. Some time ago Dr. Link likewise condemned "liberal" education as the road to "chaos and revolution." In the New York *Times* of May 18, 1937, he is quoted as describing the result of modern education. "It is," he says, "the mind systematically cultivated to question the traditions and morals of the past; the mind habituated to doubt the old and to place credence in the new; the mind which accepts no authority except the authority of its own reason." One wonders just what Dr. Link would like to see done about this problem. As an advocate of *The Return to Religion* he disapproves of the questioning attitude which he thinks responsible for the decline in religious conviction, yet as an advocate of science he exhibits both the ignorance and prejudice of the materialistic mechanist who requires the application of physical techniques

to non-physical studies. But perhaps we should expect syncretism of one who wants to go back to religion as the solution for modern problems.

A Public Appeal

There is an attitude of resentment on the part of psychologists toward Dr. Rhine. He has, they feel, made bids for popular support instead of maintaining the cloistered dignity of the worker in "pure research." For the Duke investigator, faced with the discouraging materialism of the professional psychologists, has "gone to the country" for a vote of confidence. On February 5 he reviewed his eight years of study and experiment in a free public forum at Cooper Union, New York, before a generally sympathetic audience of 500. (New York *Herald Tribune,* Feb. 6.) Appealing for co-operation, he said that "if these problems are as important as we think they are, society cannot afford to let them wait for this slow and wasteful research in isolation." He suggested that thoughtful people might conduct their own experiments in telepathy and clairvoyance under some kind of academic control, urging above all an open, inquiring attitude of mind. In a question period following his address several skeptics challenged his mathematical deductions, one questioned the social usefulness of telepathy and clairvoyance, when and if scientifically demonstrated, and another member of the audience said that the whole business should have a "theological tie-up," according to the press account of the meeting. Following is a summary of some of Dr. Rhine's remarks:

> Declaring that the research conducted at Duke and elsewhere had already "gone considerably beyond a mere question of whether extra-sensory perception occurs," Professor Rhine said the experimenters were now free to go on to other aspects of the problem. In the future, he said, efforts would be made to find out who has extra-sensory perception ability, how this mental process gears in with other better-known capacities of the mind and "where the phenomenon of extra-sensory perception fits into the general scientific picture of the day."

Food for Thought

> "On this last feature, the question of the place of extra-sensory perception in space and time, the effect of distance and the effect of time itself," Professor Rhine said, "become most important. We ask, can extra-sensory perception be accounted for by known energies? Is it affected by distance? Can it go forward in time and afford a precognitive knowledge of events which have not yet taken place?

"These considerations and their consequences to our philosophy of mind and its place in nature give us food for careful and cautious thinking, and warrant a critical and open-minded attitude, rather [than] easy belief or hasty denial."

IMPLICATIONS OF TELEPATHY

From these statements it is easy to see the revolutionary implications for modern scientific theory in the results claimed by Dr. Rhine for his experiments. He is undermining practically every preconceived idea of the life sciences, denying, in effect, their most firmly established assumptions. No wonder he is unpopular with the psychologists—and no wonder he has gone to the people for support in what he knows to be some of the facts of psychology. Unfortunately, the popularization of telepathic experimentation, while it can not fail to convince multitudes of the reality of thought-transference, will probably also have the consequence of encouraging passivity and psychism generally. That, however, will be equally the Karma of the academic opponents of Dr. Rhine, who have forced him to take this step.

LEST WE FORGET

On May 17, 1919, Secretary Bullitt, later Ambassador, wrote to Woodrow Wilson as follows:

My Dear Mr. President: I have submitted today to the Secretary of State my resignation as an assistant in the Department of State, attaché to the American Commission to negotiate peace. I was one of the millions who trusted confidently and implicitly in your leadership . . . "a permanent peace" based upon "unselfish and unbiased justice." But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections, and dismemberments—a new century of war. . . . Unjust decisions of the conference in regard to Shantung, the Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, the Saar Valley, and the abandonments of the principle of the freedom of the seas make new international conflicts certain. It is my conviction that the present league of nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and that the United States will be involved in them by the obligations undertaken in the covenant of the league and in the special understanding with France. . . .

That you personally opposed most of the unjust settlements, and that you accepted them only under great pressure, is well known. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open, instead of behind closed doors, you

> would have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours; you would have been able to resist the pressure and might have established the "new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice" of which you used to speak. . . . (*The Saturday Evening Post,* March 18, 1939.)

President Wilson never replied to that letter.

Via Victoris—Vae Victis

At the present writing a resurgent nation which in its materialistic civilization more resembles the American than any other is sweeping eastward across the Central European areas as we swept westward across our own land. The historical parallel is deadly in many senses. The German march over decadent countries and the heterogeneous remnants of national and ethnic groups is being accomplished by the same combination of force, terrorism and guile which trampled the American Indians into the dust. Nazi propaganda regarding the iniquities of the conquered matches our own unconscionable falsifications of the Red Indian character. It matches likewise the morally fictitious excuses given by Western countries for holding the Orient and Africa in durance vile.

Hitler is freely accused, and justly, of broken promises and treaties. How many of our own treaties with the Indians were ever kept, and how many were broken at the first promise of profit, with utter and shameless cynicism? How upright were the processes—including the Opium War, with which the British Empire was built?

"Righteous War"?

The American nation is in some ways being drawn closer to war with Germany than it was a month before the sinking of the Lusitania, while overlooking the greater wrongs, some of them aimed directly at us, committed in China. Nothing has yet been done by Hitler which compares in sheer atrocity with the Chino-Japanese war. Even the Jewish pogroms, so far as the broad question of humanity is concerned, do not equal it in sum-totals of human misery.

We might remember, too—before we undertake "to clean up Europe"—that since 1882, the year when lynchings taking place in the United States were first recorded, through 1937, the victims of mob violence have totalled 5,112 persons, more than four-fifths of whom were Negroes. Strange behavior for the avenging angel and defender of the Democratic Faith!

OUR RECORD

Since our emotional reaction to German policies is very clearly the source of American indignation, it is well to hark back to the historical facts of what this peculiarly American type of "righteous anger" has done for—or to—its supposed beneficiaries in the past. Instance the American Civil War over a question which in a few years more could and probably would have been settled in the right direction without bloodshed; our dispute with Spain in 1898 over Cuba, which could have been adjusted by peaceful methods; our direct and perhaps principal part in forcing the coiled spring of Germany into precisely the constriction necessary to energize it for its present reaction.

But it is most of all to the point for us to remember 1881, when the Russian Government became so angered over our expressed indignation at the terrible pogroms of that year that it passed the infamous May Laws which have now become the model—in some respects copied almost in detail—of the Nazi regulations against the German Jews of the present day. We tried to put the fire out by throwing oil on it, and the flames are still spreading.

AMERICAN ALTRUISM

It is disquieting to learn that while most of Europe fears war, many Europeans think America may play a leading role as its instigator, either by way of encouraging some countries to aggression in the hope of American support, or by provoking the "totalitarian" Governments beyond all restraint. There is perhaps a good case in logic and even in apparent morals for the United States to plan a "preventive" war against the totalitarians, in grim earnestness. There seems to be no good case in anything for the vindictiveness with which we are calling names.

"Hatred ceaseth never by hatred; hatred ceaseth only by love." Christ has waned in the West and Buddha's voice is dim in the Orient. It is accepted that we shall love only those whom we like. But there is enough objective evidence that hatred does not cease by hatred, to convince even our professional lovers of mankind, or so one would think. In our wrath over the plight of the Jews of Germany, we may be stirring to action the forces most sure to destroy them.